UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,504	11/26/2003	Franck Le	60282.00102	6168

32294 7590 07/21/2008
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE
14TH FLOOR
VIENNA, VA 22182-6212

EXAMINER	
HENNING, MATTHEW T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/721,504	LE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MATTHEW T. HENNING	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-15,18-20 and 42-65* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-15,18-20 and 42-65* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

This action is in response to the communication filed on 4/2/2008.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/2/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicants' argument that the relevant page numbers is not required in the citation of non–patent literature in an information disclosure statement, the examiner points the applicants to 37 CFR 1.98 (b)(5) wherein it is stated that the among other things, each publication listed in an IDS **must** be identified by publisher, author (if any), title, **relevant pages of the publication, date, and place of publication**. As such, the examiner still holds that these citations are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98 and as such has not considered them. See MPEP Section 609 for details about the requirements for submitting and Information Disclosure Statement.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., not knowing beforehand the algorithm used to handle the validity check) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, the applicants have argued that in the teachings of Gupta, the algorithm used to handle the packet fingerprint must be known beforehand. However, there is nothing in the claim language that forbids this from being the case. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Regarding the applicants' argument that Gupta does not disclose that the "validity information" is in a "header" of the packet, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. Gupta Fig. 3 shows the packet header 302 including the validity information (308, 310, 312 etc.) As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Because the examiner does not find the arguments persuasive, the examiner has maintained the rejections of the remaining pending claims under the previously relied upon prior art.

The examiner further notes the applicants' usage of the language "all necessary information required for performing a validity check" in the claims and throughout the specification. In order to remain consistent with the specification, the examiner has interpreted the usage of this language, for the purposes of searching and applying prior art, as meaning "all necessary information required for performing a validity check **without the checking entity needing to further communicate with the sending network node**". This interpretation is consistent with the specification, as the specification clearly shows that the checking node does not require further communication with the sending node in order to perform the validity checking, but that the checking entity may need to receive additional information from somewhere (i.e. a certificate authority) in order to perform the validity checking.

All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 4-15, 18-20, and 42-65 have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement(s) (IDS) submitted on 11/26/2003 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the

information disclosure statements. However, the examiner notes, as indicated on the signed copy, that the references listed in the IDS did not properly identify the pertinent pages of each reference, and as such were not considered. See MPEP Section 609

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 5 depends from now cancelled claim 3. For the purposes of searching and applying prior art, the examiner will assume that claim 5 was meant to depend from claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 54 is recited as depending from claim 23, which has been cancelled. Because claim 23 and its parent claims have been cancelled, the examiner cannot examiner the claim in view of prior art because the claim is not complete. However, because the claim is very similar to claim 15, the applicants can see how the claim would have been rejected had it been in independent form based upon the rejection of claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 15, 18-20, 42-43, 45-49, 55-56, 58-60, and 62-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (US Patent Number 6,389,532) hereinafter referred to as Gupta.

Regarding claim 1, Gupta disclosed a method (See Gupta Fig. 1 Element 104, 108 or 112), comprising the steps of: generating validity information for a packet (See Gupta Figs. 5-6 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 2-4), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required to perform a validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5 - Col. 7 Paragraph 2); the validity information comprising algorithm information to be used for performing the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig. 3 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4); generating a packet header (302), comprising the validity information (See Gupta Fig. 3 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4); and sending the packet including the header from a first network node to a second network node (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraph 4).

Regarding claim 18, Gupta disclosed an apparatus comprising: validity information generating means for generating validity information for a packet (See Gupta Figs. 5-6 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 2-4); packet header generating means for generating a header for the packet, comprising the validity information (See Gupta Fig. 3 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4); and sending means for sending the packet including the header to a receiving network node (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraph 4), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required for performing a validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5 - Col. 7

Paragraph 2) and the validity information comprises algorithm information to be used for performing the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4).

Regarding claim 19, Gupta disclosed a network node (See Gupta Fig. 1 Element 104 or 112) comprising: receiving means for receiving packets from a sending network node (See Gupta Fig. 1 Element 108) (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5); and performing means for performing a validity check of a packet by referring to validity information contained in a header of the packet (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 7 Paragraph 2), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required for performing the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5), and the validity information comprises algorithm information to be used for performing the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4).

Regarding claim 20, Gupta disclosed an apparatus (See Gupta Fig. 1 Element 104) comprising: forwarding means for forwarding packets from a sending network node to a receiving network node (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 7 Paragraph 2); and performing means for performing a validity check of a packet by referring to validity information contained in a header of the packet (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 7 Paragraph 2), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required for performing a validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5 - Col. 7 Paragraph 2), and the validity information comprises algorithm information to be used for performing the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4).

Regarding claim 42, Gupta disclosed an apparatus, comprising: a validity information generator configured to generate validity information for a packet (See Gupta Figs. 5-6 and Col.

6 Paragraphs 2-4); a packet header generator configured to generate a header for the packet, comprising the validity information (See Gupta Fig. 3 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4); and a transmitter configured to send the packet including the header to a receiving network node (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraph 4), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required to perform a validity check of the packet, and the validity information comprises algorithm information to be used to perform the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 3 - Col. 7 Paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 55, Gupta disclosed an apparatus, comprising: a receiver configured to receive packets from a sending network node (See Gupta Fig. 1 Element 108, Fig. 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5); and a checker configured to perform a validity check of a packet by referring to validity information contained in a header of the packet (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 7 Paragraph 2), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required to perform the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5 - Col. 7 Paragraph 2), and the validity information comprises algorithm information to be used to perform the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4).

Regarding claim 59, Gupta disclosed an apparatus, comprising: a transmitter configured to forward packets from a sending network node to a receiving network node (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5); and a checker configured to perform a validity check of a packet by referring to validity information contained in a header of the packet (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 7 Paragraph 2), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required to perform a validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5 - Col. 7

Paragraph 2), and the validity information comprises algorithm information to be used to perform the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4).

Regarding claim 63, Gupta disclosed a method comprising: receiving packets (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 5 - Col. 7 Paragraph 2); and performing a validity check of a packet by referring to validity information contained in a header of the packet (See Gupta Fig. 7 and Col. 7 Paragraph 2), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required for performing the validity check of the packet, the validity information comprising algorithm information to be used for performing the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 3 - Col. 7 Paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 64, Gupta disclosed a method comprising: forwarding received packets (Gupta Col. 7 Paragraph 2); and performing means for performing a validity check of a packet by referring to validity information contained in a header of the packet (Gupta Col. 7 Paragraph 2), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required for performing a validity check of the packet, the validity information comprising algorithm information to be used for performing the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 3 - Col. 7 Paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 65, Gupta disclosed A system, comprising: a first generator configured to generate validity information for a packet (See Gupta Fig. 3 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4); a second generator configured to generate a header for the packet , comprising the validity information (See Gupta Fig. 3 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4); a transmitter configured to send the packet including the header to a receiving network node (See Gupta Fig. 3 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required for

performing a validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig. 3 and Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4); and a checker configured to perform a validity check of a packet by referring to validity information contained in a header of the packet (Gupta Col. 7 Paragraph 2), wherein the validity information comprises all necessary information required to perform the validity check of the packet, the validity information comprising algorithm information to be used to perform the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Fig 7 and Col. 6 Paragraph 3 - Col. 7 Paragraph 2).

Regarding claims 2, 43, 56 and 60, Gupta disclosed that the generating of the validity information comprises generating security information indicating security services applied to the packet (See Gupta Col. 5 Paragraph 7).

Regarding claim 5, Gupta disclosed that the generating the algorithm information comprises generating of the algorithm information which comprises values to initialize an algorithm to be used to perform the validity check of the packet (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4, the data, the key index, the signature, or the fingerprint, for example).

Regarding claims 6, 45, 58, and 62, Gupta disclosed that the generating of the validity information comprises generating public key information of a sending node (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 2-6, for example the public and private key pair, or the key index).

Regarding claims 7, and 46 Gupta disclosed that the generating of the public key information comprises generating reference information related to how a public key can be obtained (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4 and Col. 7 Paragraph 2).

Regarding claims 8, and 47, Gupta disclosed that the generating of the reference information comprises generating an identity of an entity from which the public key can be

obtained (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4, Col. 7 Paragraph 2, and Col. 3 Line 64 – Col. 4 Line 13, wherein the index is the identity, and the entry in the table is the entity).

Regarding claims 9, and 48, Gupta disclosed that the generating of the reference information comprises generating a public key identifier for the public key (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraphs 3-4 and Col. 7 Paragraph 2, the key index).

Regarding claim 10, and 49, Gupta disclosed that the generating of the public key information comprises generating the public key (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 15 (and 54), Gupta disclosed signing the packet using a private key corresponding to a public key indicated by the validity information in the packet header in a sending network node (See Gupta Col. 6 Paragraph 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 12-14, 44, 51-53, 57, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims 1, 18, 19, and 20 above, and further in view of Naudus (US Patent Number 6,202,081).

Regarding claims 12-14, and 51-53, Gupta disclosed validation of packets, but failed to disclose that the step of generating the validity information comprises generating an information item for preventing replay attacks.

Naudus teaches that in a packet filtering system, packets should include timestamps in order to prevent replay attacks. Naudus further teaches that "[r]eplay attacks occur when a malicious user gains access to a router or other network device on a computer network that is forwarding data packets. Legitimate data packets are intercepted and then re-sent at a later time to allow the malicious user to appear as a legitimate user. A firewall helps prevent replay attacks by checking a time-stamp in the data packet that prevents the data packets from being re-sent at a later time." (See Naudus Col. 2 Paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Naudus in the packet validity checking system of Gupta by including a timestamp in each packet and verifying the timestamp at the validity checker. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to prevent replay attacks in the network. In this combination, the inclusion of a timestamp in each packet, in itself, is an indication of a procedure to be used for anti replay attacks.

Regarding claims 4, 44, 57, and 61, Gupta did not specifically teach that the step of generating the algorithm information comprises generating the algorithm information which indicates an algorithm to be used for performing the validity check of the packet. However, as taught by Naudus, in Col. 6 Line 60 - Col. 7 Line 7, it is well known to include in the packet header, an identification of which algorithm was used to sign the packet. As such, it would have

been obvious to have included this information within the packet. Furthermore, the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention would have recognized that this would allow for the user of a multiplicity of signature algorithms, as well as allowing updating of the signature algorithms in the future, and therefore it would have been obvious to have included an indication of the signature algorithm in the packet.

Claims 11, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims 6 and 23 above, and further in view of Nikander (US Patent Number 7,155,500).

Gupta disclosed including public key information within the packets, but failed to specifically disclose including the public key itself within the packets or that the step of generating the public key information comprises generating public key verification information indicating information in order to verify that the public key actually belongs to the sending node. Gupta did disclose that the public and private key pairs can be generated and stored in a certification server (See Col. 4 Paragraph 2).

Nikander teaches that by including a public key itself and the certificate of the public key, the receiving host can verify that the public key is truly owned by the sender (See Nikander Col. 10 Line 50 – Col. 12 Line 9).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Nikander in the packet verification system of Gupta by including the public key and public key certificate within each packet and verifying that the sender of each packet owned the public key used to sign the packet. This would have been

obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to ensure that a malicious node was not claiming to be a different node.

Conclusion

Claims 1-2, 4-15, 18-20, and 42-65 have been rejected.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. HENNING whose telephone number is (571)272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew T Henning/

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131